

### **Remarks**

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

### **Claim Amendments**

Claims 1-26 are in the case. No claims have been amended. New claims 22-26 have been added.

### **Claim Objections**

The examiner has objected to claims 2, 7, and 12 as being dependent on rejected base claims but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claims. Applicant submits herewith independent claims 22-24 which are simply claims 2, 7, and 12 written with the elements of their respective base claims. No amendments to the scope of these claims have been made. Accordingly, allowance is respectfully requested.

### **Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102**

The examiner has rejected claims 1, 3-6, 8-11 and 13-21 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by Steele US 5,826,900. Applicant respectfully traverses. It is well settled that “A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is not found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” See MPEP 2131.

Steele does not teach or disclose a mounting member having “a bore extending from the first side to the second side of the mounting member”. Rather, the threaded hole 30 disclosed in Steele is disposed to receive a bolt 36, but does not extend from a first side to a second side. In fact, if Steele’s bolt 36 were made to extend through to a second side, Steele’s foot support would fail, as it appears the bolt 36 would either interfere with pin 22, making it impossible to connect the pin 22 to the body 14, or weaken the structure of the foot support. See e.g. FIG. 1 of Steele.

Further, Steele does not teach or disclose “a bore insert ... adapted to allow the bore insert to engage the bore of the mounting member from either the first side or the second side”. Again, such an adaptation would be impossible with the Steele arrangement.

Even further, Steele does not teach or disclose “a bore insert stop adapted to prevent the bore insert from passing through the bore.” The threaded bolt the examiner refers to as the insert does not have a bore insert stop. While it does have a bolt head, it is unclear if the bolt head engages the member 34 or the threads reach the bottom of the threaded bore 30.

Because Steele fails to teach each and every element of claims 1, 6, 12 and 19 and claims 2-5, 7-11, 12-18 and 20-21 which respectively depend there from, Applicants respectfully request re-allowance of the claims as originally presented.

### **New Claims**

New Claims 25-26 have been added to further clarify that the position of the insert stop may be adjusted in order to create a determined amount of space between either the first side or second side of the mounting member and the mounting bracket. This can allow the insert to be sized in order to accommodate different mounting bracket configurations. No new matter has been added and allowance is respectfully requested.

### **Conclusion**

Applicant submits all the claims in the present application, specifically claims 1-26 are in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

If there are any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (503) 796-2496. Also, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge shortages or credit overpayments to Deposit Account No. 500393.

Respectfully submitted,

SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C.

Dated: January 4, 2006



Christopher D. Goodman

Registration No. 34,338

Pacwest Center, Suite 1900  
1211 SW Fifth Avenue  
Portland, Oregon 97204  
Telephone: (503) 222-9981